



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/315,795	05/21/1999	AMIR WEINBERG	MERCURY.1CP1	6943

7590

05/29/2002

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
620 NEWPORT CENTER DR
16TH FLR
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THU HA T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 05/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/315,795

Applicant(s)

WEINBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Thu Ha T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims **28- 70** are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 28-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Nielsen** U.S. Patent No. **5,813,007**, in view of **Rappaport et al** (hereinafter Rappaport) U.S. Patent No. **4,752,889**.

4. As to claim 28, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-implemented method for facilitating the management of a web site, comprising:

scanning the web site to generate a first data structure which represents the web site at a first point in time, wherein the web site comprises a collection of inter-linked hypertextual documents (figure 3, col. 2 lines 67-col. 3 lines 16, col. 3 lines 38-col. 4 lines 5, col. 9 lines 14-42, col. 12 lines 15-col. 13 lines 61);

subsequently, after changes have been made to the web site, scanning the web site to generate a second data structure which represents the web site at a second point in time (figures 8, 9, col. 3 lines 38-col. 4 lines 5, col. 11 lines 38-col. 13 lines 61),

comparing the first data structure to the second data structure to identify modifications that were made to the web site between the first and the second points in time (col. 12 lines 6-col. 13 lines 61).

However, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the step of generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications are represented. **Rappaport** teaches the step of generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications are represented (figures 3, 4, col. 4 lines 18-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen** and **Rappaport** to have the step of generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications are represented because it would help the management system to display, check and maintain the functional relationships between elements of the web site.

5. As to claim 29, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the step of generating the graphical map comprises

Art Unit: 2155

displaying at least one of the following types of objects in a distinct color: new nodes, new links, modified nodes, deleted nodes, and deleted links (figure 9, abstract, col. 2 lines 5-31, col. 6 lines 45-col. 7 lines 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the step of generating the graphical map comprises displaying at least one of the following types of objects in a distinct color: new nodes, new links, modified nodes, deleted nodes, and deleted links because it would help the management system to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1, supra.

6. As to claim 30, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the step of generating the graphical map comprises presenting a user an option to specify types of modifications to be displayed within the map (figures 3, 4, col. 4 lines 18-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

7. As to claim 31, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the graphical map includes icons that represent modified web pages, and the method further comprises responding to user selection of an icon that represents a modified web page by displaying the modified web page (figure 4, col. 4 lines 46-col. 5 lines 37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2155

Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

8. As to claim 32, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the step of generating the graphical map comprises using a layout algorithm to position graphical representations of nodes and links of the web site on a display screen (figures 3-8, col. 5 lines 25-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 1.

9. As to claim 33, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, further comprising automatically sending to a user an email message which lists at least some of the modifications (abstract, figure 10, col. 4 lines 27-55).

10. As to claim 34, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the web site is scanned and the first and second data structures compared automatically according to a pre-specified schedule (abstract, figure 5, col. 3 lines 17-32, col. 12 lines 6-48).

11. As to claim 35, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein scanning the web site comprises storing attributes which indicate dates and

times of last modification of content objects of the web site, and comparing the first and second data structures comprises comparing the attributes of like content objects to identify content objects that have been modified (col. 3 lines 33-67, col. 12 lines 6-48).

12. As to claim 36, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-implemented method for facilitating the analysis of a web comprising:

comparing the web site at a first point in time to the web site at a second point in time to identify modifications made to the web site between the first and second points in time, wherein the web site comprises a collection of hypertextual documents interconnected by one or more links (abstract, figure 5, col. 2 lines 67-col. 4 lines 5, col. 9 lines 14-42, col. 12 lines 6-col. 13 lines 61).

However, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the step of generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications to the web site are highlighted.

Rappaport teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including the step of generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications to the web site are highlighted (figures 3, 4, col. 4 lines 18-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen** and **Rappaport** to have the step of generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications to the web site are highlighted because it would help the management system and user easy to see, check and maintain the functional changed relationships between elements of the web site.

13. As to claim 37, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the step of generating the graphical map comprises displaying at least one of the following types of objects in a distinct color: new nodes, new links, modified nodes, deleted nodes, and deleted links (figure 9, abstract, col. 2 lines 5-31, col. 6 lines 45-col. 7 lines 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in paragraph 12, *supra*.

14. As to claim 38, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the step of generating the graphical map comprises highlighting at least the following types of objects: new nodes, new links, modified nodes, deleted nodes, and deleted links (figures 3, 4, 9, abstract, col. 2 lines 5-31, col. 4 lines 18-59, col. 6 lines 45-col. 7 lines 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in paragraph 12.

15. As to claim 39, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the step of generating the graphical map comprises presenting a user an option to specify types of modifications to be displayed within the

map (figures 3, 4, col. 4 lines 18-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in paragraph 12.

16. As to claim 40, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the graphical map includes icons that represent modified web pages, and the method further comprises responding to user selection of an icon that represents a modified web page by displaying the modified web page (figure 4, col. 4 lines 46-col. 5 lines 37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in paragraph 12.

17. As to claim 41, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the step of wherein generating the graphical map comprises using a layout algorithm to position graphical representations of nodes and links of the web site within the map (figures 3-8, col. 5 lines 25-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in paragraph 12.

18. As to claim 42, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein comparing the web site comprises automatically scanning the web site

Art Unit: 2155

according to a pre-specified schedule (abstract, figure 5, col. 3 lines 17-32, col. 12 lines 6-48).

19. As to claim 43, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, further comprising sending an email message to a prespecified address to notify a user of results of an automated scanning and comparison event (abstract, figure 10, col. 4 lines 27-55).

20. As to claim 44, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein comparing the web site comprises scanning the web site to generate a current representation of the web site, and comparing the current representation to a prior representation on a node-by-node and link-by-link basis to identify the modifications (col. 3 lines 33-67, col. 12 lines 6-48).

21. As to claim 45, **Neilsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a computer program, the computer program comprising:

a scanning module which scans a web site to generate a representation of the web site, the representation specifying at least an arrangement of nodes and links of the web site (abstract, figure 5, col. 3 lines 17-32, col. 12 lines 6-48),

a comparison module which compares representations of the web site generated by the scanning module at different times to identify modifications made to the web site (col. 3 lines 33-67, col. 12 lines 6-48).

However, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach a mapping module which generates a graphical site map in which at least some of the modifications are highlighted.

Rappaport teaches a mapping module which generates a graphical site map in which at least some of the modifications are highlighted (figures 3, 4, col. 4 lines 18-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the step of generates a graphical site map in which at least some of the modifications are highlighted because it would help the management system easy to check and maintain the functional relationships between elements of the web site.

22. As to claim 46, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the comparison module automatically identifies at least the following types of modifications: new nodes, new links, modified nodes, deleted nodes, and deleted links (figure 9, abstract, col. 2 lines 5-31, col. 6 lines 45-col. 7 lines 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in paragraph 21.

23. As to claim 47, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the comparison module uses content object attributes that indicate dates and times of last modification to automatically identify nodes that have been modified (col. 3 lines 33-67, col. 12 lines 6-48).

24. As to claim 48, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the scanning and comparison modules operate according to a predefined schedule to automatically scan and identify changes to the web site (abstract, figure 5, col. 3 lines 17-32, col. 12 lines 6-48).

25. As to claim 49, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the comparison module automatically sends an email message to a pre-specified address to notify a user of an automated comparison event (abstract, figure 10, col. 4 lines 27-55).

26. As to claim 50, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the mapping module presents a user an option to specify types of modifications to be displayed within the site map (figures 3, 4, col. 4 lines 18-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen** and **Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in paragraph 21.

27. As to claim 51, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the mapping module presents the user an option to display or conceal each of the following types of objects within the site map: new nodes, modified nodes, deleted nodes, unmodified nodes, new links, deleted links, and unmodified links (figures 3, 4, 9, abstract, col. 2 lines 5-31, col. 4 lines 18-59, col. 6 lines 45-col. 7 lines 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in paragraph 21.

28. As to claim 52, **Nielsen** does not explicitly the invention as claimed, however, **Rappaport** teaches the mapping module implements a layout algorithm to position graphical representations of nodes and links on a display screen according to an organizational structure of the web site (figures 3-8, col. 5 lines 25-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in paragraph 21.

29. As to claim 53, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Rappaport** teaches wherein the graphical map comprises representations of a plurality of nodes of the web site (figures 3-8, col. 5 lines 25-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the graphical map comprises

representations of a plurality of nodes of the web site because it would have an efficient computing management system that help user can easily to see the change of web site.

30. As to claim 54, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Rappaport** teaches wherein the graphical map further comprises representations of plurality of links of the web site (figures 3-8, col. 5 lines 25-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 53.

31. As to claim 55, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Rappaport** teaches the step of generating a graphical map (figures 3, 4, col. 4 lines 18-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 53.

32. As to claim 56, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer program capable of performing the method of claim 28 (col. 4 lines 55-col. 5 lines 20, col. 7 lines 50-67).

33. As to claim 63, **Nielsen** teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-implemented method for facilitating the management of the web site, comprising:

scanning the web site to generate a first data structure that includes representations of a plurality of nodes and links of the web site at a first point in time (figure 3, col. 2 lines 67-col. 3 lines 16, col. 3 lines 38-col. 4 lines 5, col. 9 lines 14-42, col. 13 lines 4-28, col. 12 lines 15-col. 13 lines 61);

subsequently, after changes have been made to the web site, scanning the web site to generate a second data structure that includes representations of a plurality of nodes and links of the web site at a second point in time (figures 8, 9, col. 3 lines 38-col. 4 lines 5, col. 11 lines 38-col. 13 lines 61),

comparing the first data structure to the second data structure to identify changes made to the web site between the first and the second points in time (col. 12 lines 6-col. 13 lines 61).

However, **Neilsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed. **Rappaport** teaches the step of generating a graphical map that depicts at least some of the changes, the graphical map including graphical representations of at least one of the following: (a) nodes that were added to the web site between first and second points in time; (b) links that were added to the web site between first and second points in time; (c) nodes that were deleted from the web site between the first and second points in time; (d) links that were deleted from the web site between the first and second points in time; and (e) nodes of the web site that were modified between the first and second

Art Unit: 2155

points in time (figures 3, 4, 9, abstract, col. 2 lines 5-31, col. 4 lines 18-59, col. 6 lines 45-col. 7 lines 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the step of generating a graphical map that depicts at least some of the changes because it would have an efficient computing management system that help user can easily to see the change of web site.

34. As to claim 64, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Rappaport** teaches wherein the graphical map includes representations of at least two of (a)-(e) (figures 3, 4, 9, abstract, col. 2 lines 5-31, col. 4 lines 18-59, col. 6 lines 45-col. 7 lines 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 63.

35. As to claim 65, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Rappaport** teaches wherein the graphical map includes representations of at least three of (a)-(e) (figures 3, 4, 9, abstract, col. 2 lines 5-31, col. 4 lines 18-59, col. 6 lines 45-col. 7 lines 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 63.

Art Unit: 2155

36. As to claim 66, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Rappaport** teaches wherein the graphical map includes representations of at least four of (a)-(e) (figures 3, 4, 9, abstract, col. 2 lines 5-31, col. 4 lines 18-59, col. 6 lines 45-col. 7 lines 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 63.

37. As to claim 67, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Rappaport** teaches wherein the graphical map includes representations of all of (a)-(e) (figures 3, 4, 9, abstract, col. 2 lines 5-31, col. 4 lines 18-59, col. 6 lines 45-col. 7 lines 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 63.

38. As to claim 68, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Rappaport** teaches wherein the graphical map is a color coded to distinguish between at least some of (a)-(e) (figure 9, abstract, col. 2 lines 5-31, col. 6 lines 45-col. 7 lines 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 63.

39. As to claim 69, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Rappaport** teaches further comprising presenting a user an option to interactively control which of (a)-(e) are to be displayed in the graphical map (figures 3, 4, col. 4 lines 18-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 63.

40. As to claim 70, **Nielsen** does not explicitly teach the invention as claimed; however, **Rappaport** teaches the step of generating a graphical map (figures 3, 4, col. 4 lines 18-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the same motivation as set forth in claim 53.

41. Claims 57-62 have similar limitations as claims 53-56; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

42. Applicant's arguments filed March 06, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

43. Applicants argue that cited prior arts do not teach the claimed invention. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Nielsen teaches a method of scanning the web site to generate a first data structure which represents the web site at a first point in time, wherein the web site comprises a collection of inter-linked hypertextual documents; subsequently, after changes have been made to the web site, scanning the web site to generate a second data structure which represents the web site at a second point in time; comparing the first data structure to the second data structure to identify modifications that were made to the web site between the first and the second points in time (figures 3, 8-9, col. 2 lines 67-col. 3 lines 16, col. 3 lines 38-col. 4 lines 5, col. 9 lines 14-42, col. 12 lines 15-col. 13 lines 61).

However, **Neilsen** does not explicitly teach the step of generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications are represented. **Rappaport** teaches the step of generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications are represented (figures 3, 4, col. 4 lines 18-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Nielsen and Rappaport** to have the step of generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications are represented because it would help the management system to display, check and maintain the functional relationships between elements of the web site and help user can easily to see the change of web site.

As a result, cited prior arts do disclose a system and method for facilitating the management of a web site, as broadly claimed by the applicants. Applicants clearly have still failed to identify specific claim limitation that would define a clearly patentable distinction over prior arts.

In response to applicants' argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. ***In re Nomiya*, 184 USPO 607 (CCPA 1975)**. However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. ***In re McLaughlin*, 170 USPO 209 (CCPA 1971)**. References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. ***In re Bozek*, 163 USPO 545 (CCPA) 1969**. In this case, the reason to include the step of generating a graphical map in which at least some of the modifications are represented because it would help the management system to display, check and maintain the functional relationships between elements of the web site and help user can easily to see the change of web site.

Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 28, 36, 45, 63. Claims 29-35, 37-44, 46-62, 64-70 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims

Art Unit: 2155

and by other reasons set forth in the previous office action [see Paper No. 10 and 12].

Accordingly, claims 28-70 are respectfully rejected.

Conclusion

44. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

45. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703) 305-7447. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2155

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SPE Ayaz R. Sheikh, can be reached at (703) 305-9648.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

The fax number for art unit 2155 is (703) 305-7201.

Thu Ha Nguyen

May 22, 2002



AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100